



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VII.

VARIA PLAUTINA.¹

COMPILED BY W. M. LINDSAY.

I. *The Pronunciation of ch (Gk. χ) in Plautus's Time.*

As Gk. βραχίον, lit. 'the shorter part of the arm' (from the shoulder to the elbow), became in Latin of all periods *brachium*, with the first syllable long by 'position' (*bracchium*), so in Plautus Gk. Ἀχέρων appears as *Acheruns* (*Accheruns*), with cretic scansion. Baier (*Abhandl. . . . Hertz*, p. 275) has shewn that the word *Achilles* in some passages of Plautus (e.g. Merc. 488), if not in all (Mil. 1054), has its first syllable long by 'position' (*Acchilles*).

And yet, if we examine other words with *ch* (Gk. χ) in Plautus, we find that the syllable preceding this sound is scanned short. Instances are *Cleomachus*, Bacc. 589; *Eutychus*, Merc. 474; *Lysimachus* (*passim*), *Mnesilochus* (*pass.*), *Philolaches*, Most. 610, 622, etc.; *stomachus*, 'chagrin,' Asin. 423. *Drachuma*, the Plautine form, cannot be reckoned as evidence, for in Greek the χ precedes a consonant, δραχμή, and may have had a different sound from intervocalic χ.

The explanation of the discrepancy seems to be that in the first three words mentioned, *brachium*, *Acheruns*, *Achilles*, a plebeian pronunciation of Gk. χ forced its way into literary Latin, while in words that were not, like these, in every-day use a more correct reproduction of the Greek sound was followed in educated circles. Is there any evidence against this theory?

That *stomachus* was a word in every-day use cannot be shewn. Even if it were, the short penult could be explained in the same way as the short penult of *Philippus*, the name of the coin (see above), in Plautus, viz. through the influence of the accent on the first syllable, — *stómachus*, *Philippus*, like Gk. στόμαχος, Φίλιππος. The word *machaera* would certainly be a word in every-day use. In all passages

¹ [The following notes were compiled by Mr. Lindsay from statistics furnished by the class dissertations. See the Prefatory Note on p. iii f.]

where the word occurs in Plautus, the quantity is indeterminable,¹ except, perhaps, Pseud. 593, a line where unfortunately both text and metre are somewhat doubtful. It seems most natural, however, to scan the line as an anapaestic tetrameter acatalectic, like v. 592:

lubet scire quid hic uelit (*ueniat* A) cūm māchaera; et huic, quān rem
agat, hinc dabo insidias.

If this scansion be right, the spelling *macchaera* must take its place beside *Accheruns* and *Acchilles* in Plautus; and the pronunciation of Gk. χ as *cch* will be, not isolated, but universal in words of everyday use.

II. *Tetini* and *Tenui*.

Nonius (p. 178 M.) mentions two Old Latin verb forms: *tetinerit* 'pro tenuerit' and *tetulit* 'tulit,' with examples of their use by the Republican dramatists. Investigation has shewn that *tetuli* is the normal Plautine form, though in our MSS. it is changed, as is natural, to *tuli*, or *detuli*, or *te tuli*. What of *tetini*?

The difference between the two perfect formations *tetini* and *tenui* would seem to be that the latter is of the intransitive type, like the intransitive verbs of the second conjugation, *caleo*, *calui*, etc., so that one might expect to find *tetini* expressing the transitive, and *tenui* the intransitive sense of the verb. What are the facts of Plautus's usage of the two forms?

(1) Passages which support the form *tetini* (*-tini*).

Asin. 582 nimis aēgre risum *cōntini* ubi hōspitem inclamāuit (continui P,
A n. l.).

The metre requires *contini*.

Amph. 926 nunc quādo factis me impudicis *ābstinei* (abstines P, *A n. l.*).

Amph. 690 ān te auspiciū cōmmoratum est ān tempestas *cōtinit* (con-
tinet P, *A n. l.*).

The reading of the MSS. is not impossible.

Mil. 1327 nām nil miror, sī libenter, Phīlocomasium, hīc eras,

(sī) forma[m] huius, mōres, uirtus [hīc] *āttinere* animum hīc tuom
(animum attinere P, *A n. l.*).

¹ As of the fourth syllable of the compound name *Polymachaeroplagesides*.

Another possible emendation would be *animum attinere*. But *attinere* as the 'lectio difficilior' is probably right, and transposition of neighboring words with the same initial is a common occurrence in MSS.

(2) Passages which support the form *tenui*.

Capt. 655 núculeum amisí, *retinui* pígneri putámina.

The editors follow Donatus's quotation of this line (ad Ter. *Ad*. V. iii. 10) through doubt of the possibility of the reading of the MSS. (=P) *reliqui*. But *reliqui* is also the reading of Nonius (p. 157 M.) and seems to be paralleled by Stich. 258 sqq.:

GEL. Linguam quoque etiam uendidi datariam. CROC. Au,
nullan tibi lingua est? GEL. Quae quidem dicat 'dabo';
uentri reliqui eccam aliam quae dicat 'cedo' (*AP*).

We should therefore read *reliqui*, not *retinui*.

Men. 588 sqq. (after a passage in which bacchiacs and cretics predominate)
sicut me hodie nimis sollicitum cliens quidam habuit, neque
quod uolui
agere aut quicum licitumst, ita med *attinuit*, ita *detinuit*,
apud aediles pro eius factis plurumisque pessumisque
dixi causam, etc. (The rest of the passage is trochaic.)

Editors make vv. 588–9 anapaestic, so that the forms *attinuit* and *detinuit* are necessary. But is there not a greater likelihood that they are trochaic, v. 588, the opening line of the passage, being an octonarius and the second a septenarius? Trochaic metre requires *detinit* (presumably with *attinit*).

Epid. 130 quód ad me *attinuit*, égo curaui: quód manda(ui)stí mihi. (P,
A n. l.)

The reading of the MSS. may be retained if we change *me* to *med*. This would allow *attinit* equally with *attinuit*.

(3) Passages in which either form would be equally allowable.

(a) Of doubtful metre.

Poen. 1181 sqq. certo enim quod quidem ad nos duas *attinuit* praepotentes
pulchre
pacisque potentes, soror, fuimus, neque ab iuuentute inibi
inridiculo
habitaе, etc. (*AP*.)

To make these lines anapaestic requires an impossible scansion *praepotētes*. The opening words have the cretic rhythm: *cérto enim quód quidem ad nós duas*; and this would require *attinit*.

(*b*) Of known metre.

Cist. 675 *quamne ín manibus ténui atque accépi hic ante aédis* (*P, A n. l.*).
Most. 268 *út speculum tenulsti, metuo né ol[e]ant argentúm manus* (*P, A n. l.*).

Poen. 317 ANT. *Nímia nos socórdia hodie ténuit*. AD. *Qua de re, óbsecro?* (*AP*).

Mil. 1309 *nam si ábstinuissem amórem, [quem] tamquam hoc útere(r)* (*P, A n. l.*).

Rud. 93 *eo uós amici détinui diútius* (*P, A n. l.*).

Whether the line is correct as it stands (with *diútius*) or requires emendation, the two forms *detinui* and *detini* seem to be equally allowable.

Asin. 414 *siquidem hércle nunc summúm Iouem te dícas detinulsse* (*P, A n. l.*).

Cist. 225 *ita páter apud uillam détinuit me hos díes sex ruri cóntínuos* (*P, A n. l.*).

To summarize our results,—the form *tetini* (*-tini*) is certainly established for Plautus, in spite of the change of this unfamiliar form by the scribes, in the transitive verbs *contineo* (Asin. 582, and perhaps Amph. 690), *abstineo* (Amph. 926), and with some probability in the transitive verb *attineo* (Mil. 1327). With regard to the form *tenui* there is not sufficient evidence to prove that it ever was used by Plautus, nor, if it was used by him, to determine how far it competed with the form *tetini*. The evidence of Poen. 1181 inclines me to believe that he used *attini* even in the intransitive sense of the verb.

A word in conclusion on the intransitive sense of *teneo*. In classical Latin it appears in *attineo* and *pertineo*. In Plautus we have also *transtineo* and *contineo*:

Mil. 468 *nímis beat quod cómmeatus tránstinet trans párietem*,
Stich. 452 *per hórtum utroque cómmeatus cóntinet*.

One is tempted to put *obstineo*, as an intransitive by-form of *ostendo*, in Epid. 19 :

TH. Quid tibi uis dicam nisi quod est? EP. Ut illaé res obsteneánt. TH. Probe.

Here *A* seems to offer *obstenia* —, while in the Palatine archetype the latter part of the line was lost. What the Palatine scribe made of it was *ut illi respon*, the last word being conjecturally emended by subsequent copyists to *respondi* (B²) and *respondit* (E²).

III. *Omnis Totus*.

Varro (*L. L.* vii. 103) quotes in illustration of the verb *gannio* a line from a lost play ascribed to Plautus (*frag. inc.* 3):

gannít odiosus ómni totae fámiliae,

which introduces us to the curious *omnis totus*, one of those pleonastic expressions which are characteristic of colloquial or plebeian Latin. We might reasonably expect to find the phrase used elsewhere by Plautus; and if we reflect how liable a pleonastic phrase of the kind would be to alteration at the hand of scribes, it seems worth investigating whether some lines which contain the word *omnis* or the word *totus*, and which are metrically defective, may not find their true restoration in the substitution of the fuller phrase.

Thus in Most. 904, where Theopropides comes with his slave Tranio out of the house which he supposes his son to have bought, and can scarcely find words strong enough to express his satisfaction at the purchase (cf. vv. 906–7 TRAN. Ecquíd placent? | THEOP. Écquid placeant, mé rogas? immo hércle uero pérplacent), the defective line offered by the MSS. (*P, A n. l.*):

TR. Quid tibi uisumst mércimoni? TH. ** totus gaúdeo,

may very suitably be restored by the substitution of *omnis totus* for *totus*, especially as the collocation *mercimōi ōis* would facilitate the omission of the word *omnis* :

Quíd tibi uisumst mércimoni? (Ómnis) totus gaúdeo.

Another defective line is Epid. 282, where the slave Epidicus is explaining his plot to Apocides and Periphanes:

EPID. Iam ígitur amota éí erit omnis † consultátio (*P, A n. l.*).

It is conceivable that Plautus wrote *omnis tota consultatio* and that some scribe omitted the pleonastic *tota*.¹ At the same time it must be allowed that Lindemann's change of *erit* to *fuert* is supported by v. 225 (*fuert A, edd.; erit P*).

In Truc. 906, where the 'meretrix' Phronesium is giving a very exaggerated account of the aliment necessary for her young son, the MSS. (*P, A n. l.*) offer :

oleum opus est fairna purus est totum diem.

If we suppose *purus* to be a corruption of *puerus*² (cf. *puere* Voc., *socerus* Nom.), and suppose the second *est* to be 3d sing. pres. ind. of *edo*, we might restore the line to metrical form in this way :

ōleo opust, farīna ; puerus ést <omnem> totúm diem.

But the addition of a second *opus est* (*opust*) is an equally plausible emendation : *oleo opus est, <opust> farina*, etc., and avoids the unpleasant metrical ictus *omnēm totúm*.

In Curc. 446, where the MSS. offer :

libiamque oram omnem † contere(-ne-)bromniam,

we may put a comma after *omnem* and read :

Libyamque oram omnem, <omnem> Contenebroniā,

with legitimate hiatus at the pause in the sentence ; or else *omnem, <totam> Cont.*

IV. *Nullus and Ullus.*

The word *nullus* is a diminutive compound of the negative particle *ně* (cf. *ně-queo, ně-fas*) and the numeral adjective *unus*, **ně-ūn(u)lus*, 'not (even) a little one.' According to the generally accepted theory the word *ullus* is of later origin, having been

¹ The course of the corruption may have been as follows :— First the verb *tota* was omitted by the scribe. Then it was written above *omnis* by the 'corrector.' Then it was omitted (as a suprascript gloss) by the scribe who made a copy of the MS.

² Is *pure* (*purae*) of the Nonius MSS. (*s.v. capere*, p. 253 M., and *s.v. lautus*, p. 337 M.) in the quotation from Lucilius to be corrected to *puere*? The line may be read thus : *málsine esse? laútum e mensa, púere, capturú's cibum?* (*malis necesse edd. 253, m. n. est edd. 337*).

formed from *nullus* after the analogy of *unquam*, the correlative of *nunquam* (**nē-unquam*), *usquam*, the correlative of *nusquam* (**nē-usquam*), much as our 'ought' has been formed from 'nought.' Does the Plautine usage of the two words *nullus* and *ullus* support this theory?

If the theory be true, we should expect to find *ullus* in much less frequent use than *nullus*. That is precisely what we do find. In Helwich's *Lexicon of the Adjectives of Plautus* 152 instances of *nullus* are mentioned, but only 68 of *ullus*. And the latter list is capable of reduction. For the Plautine idiom of doubling the negative, e.g.

Pseud. 136 Neque ego homines magis asinos nunquam uidi: ita plagis costae callent,

was not understood by the scribes, who often changed the second negative to an affirmative form. In this line, for example, the Palatine MSS. have *unquam*, while the Ambrosian Palimpsest alone preserves *nunquam*. (See Habich *de Negationum aliquot usu Plautino*, Halle 1893, pp. 6 sqq.) Similarly *nullus* is changed to *ullus* in the Renaissance MSS. of Rud. 359:

Nec te aleator núllus est sapiéntior profecto, etc.

In Most. 712 *nihil . . . ullum* is the reading of *A*, *nihil . . . nullum* of *P*.

In the second place, we should expect to find *ullus* making its *début* in such phrases as *non ullus*, *neque ullus*, phrases which are removed by a single step from *nullus* (cf. *non queo* beside *nequeo*). Here, too, the Plautine usage corroborates our theory. The normal type of phrase with *ullus* may be seen in the first instance in Helwich's list:

Amph. 328 SO. Nón equidem ullum habeo iumentum. MERC. Onerándus est pugnis probe.

Phrases like Capt. 131 *sed si ullo pacto*, Mil. 1207 *si possem ullo modo*, Bacch. 120 *an deus est ullus?* Poen. 450 *qui . . . leno ullam Veneri umquam immolarit hostiam*, where the word *ullus* gives evidence of a more independent existence, are the exception, not the rule, in Plautus. Our investigation, then, has resulted in a corroboration of the prevailing theory.